national purpose—this is one of the great and challenging tasks before our democracy today.

The article follows:

GOVERNMENT AND THE ARTS

(By August Heckscher)

The arts have been recognized in almost all ages as being closely related to the quality and the well-being of a people's life. Great epochs have been those in which the arts flourished. Conversely, when political life seemed to decline, when the people succumbed to a general listlessness and boredom, the arts, too, sank to a low ebb. It is, of course, possible for a lonely genius to be produced in any period, even amid the least favorable circumstances. His skill and vision will assert themselves regardless of the surrounding mood. But that contagion from a wide circle of talent, infusing the whole artistic life with brilliance and vigor, exists only when all parts of a society are self-confident and genuinely alive.

The greatest ages have been marked by what may be called a common style. Not only have the various forms of art shown an affinity, but there has been a recognizable connection between the achievements of the artists and the great figures in other fields of life. Thus we can recognize quite clearly a Greek or a Roman style. Keats, in one of his letters, speaks of "the undefinable gusto of the Elizabethan voice." The accents of that voice may be heard as clearly in the great explorers and men of action as in the playwrights and poets of the age.

The full expression of artistic genius has been recognized by rulers in all periods as a chief mark of their glory—second, perhaps, only to military conquest. And in comparison to military conquest, artistic achievements have proved incomparably the more durable. The empire of the Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella is of little moment to us now. The extraordinary flowering of the arts which marked their reign has never been forgotten. What one writer has called the beneficent residue is all that speaks to us of a past age; and the works of painters, writers, musicians, architects and playwrights form that residue—not the political quarrels or the military victories and defeats which seemed so important at the time.

In the formative period of our own history, a high value was placed on these marks of a high civilization. Laws and institutions seemed vitally important. So did outward forms that would reflect the hopes and ambitions of the young Republic. Cities spaciously laid out, public buildings displaying both grandeur and taste, painters capable of preserving for posterity great scenes and moments—these were ardently desired, and within the limits of that still rough and struggling society were effectively promoted.

Modern America lost something of this first concern for the arts. The tasks of opening a continent and multiplying its material wealth consumed enormous energies. Education was highly valued throughout the 19th century; but it was an education leading toward practical skills, not to the full expression of those inner values and visions which are the soil of artistic achievement. The cultivation of art was left largely to a few very rich patrons, in that period of their life when all other possibilities for acquisition and power had been exhausted.

It was natural that the pendulum should swing, and from all the evidence it has recently swung very far in the opposite direction. Today we recognize that the arts are an overwhelmingly important element in the total picture of America which the world forms and upon which it acts. Indeed the rivalry of the cold war, like most great rivalries of history, may ultimately turn upon this point. It is significant that in the worst days of the Berlin crisis of 1961 General Clay sent back word urgently requesting that a first-rate exhibition of art be sent over to the beleaguered city. And it may be worth remembering that during the tensest hours of the recent Cuban crisis, Mr. Khrushchev was reported as spending 4 hours at the opera.

At home, and in the everyday conduct of our democracy, the arts seem no less related to the attainment of our national purposes. It is difficult to see how we shall make the change from being a people rural in heart and soul to a great urban civilization unless the arts in all their forms make city life seem both entertaining and ennobling. A city without a brilliant cultural life must always be a dreary spectacle—a soul-deadening crowd cut off from the sources of its being. In the same way it is difficult to see how we shall keep ourselves alive amid an ever-expanding leisure except as the arts become a dominant interest among the people.

We aspire to greatness as a world power, to happiness as a people, to vitality as the first mass democracy that has ever been able to combine a deepening spiritual life with unparalleled physical and material well-being. For all these reasons the arts have a close relationship to the Nation. They are part of the common life, not of individual existence alone.

Promotion of the arts is therefore a legitimate public concern. The question of how they can be promoted is difficult and open to many interpretations. We would probably all agree that if by spending a certain number of billions of dollars we could attain results as definite and predictable as in scientific research the money would be well spent. But actually we do not know how to produce genius. The expenditure of public funds, however useful and necessary within strict limits, might well be done in such a way as to defeat the very ends we are seeking. The Government could build theaters, but it would have no assurance that the stages would evoke another Shakespeare. It could subsidize schools of art, but would have no proof that a Leonardo would emerge.

In this field, as in all new fields of political activities, a tentative, experimental and perhaps piecemeal approach should be pursued. The following considerations are among those which should guide policy formation.

1. Government must be careful to supplement and encourage, but not to undermine, the complex structure of private support for the arts which has been characteristic of this country. The United States is rich beyond any other country in the habit of voluntary giving, with the accompanying sense of participation and involvement. To disregard this would be to leave our cultural life the poorer, no matter how generously government funds might be spent.

2. The role of the States and localities must be encouraged. New York has pioneered with a state Arts Council with funds sufficient to allow the diffusion of the best in its arts, the cultivation of new talent in smaller communities, and perhaps the ultimate support of major cultural institutions. Other States are now watching New York closely. To the extent that they follow its lead, the Federal Government would find it a natural and easy step to support these efforts with matching grants.

3. Government at various levels must be careful to act in such a way as not to limit the freedom and variety of the arts. It is quite possible, in this as in other fields, to establish boards and committees independent of political control. It is reasonable to believe that the judgment of such bodies will be increasingly respected by political authorities. Besides, there is much that government can do in the form of simple housekeeping—maintenance and building of plant, or the hiring of the services of artistic institutions—which create very little opportunity for interference in the artistic management.

4. Government itself, in all it does in the ordinary pursuit of its business, can take care to set an example and to maintain the highest standards. In what it builds, at the points where it determines the shape of the landscape as in the planning of roads and urban regions, it must move with an awareness of esthetic considerations. In the objects upon which it sets its mark, from the post box at the corner to the White House at the center of the Nation's life, it must concern itself with excellence.

"Literature can take care of itself," said Pitt, when appealed to for help on behalf of one of England's great authors. "Yes," answered Robert Southey, "it will take care of itself, and of you too, if you do not look to it."

Carlyle, who records this interchange, adds characteristically that of all priesthoods and governing classes now extant in the world, "there is no class comparable for importance to the priesthood of the Writers of Books." To make the generalization convincing, we have to include the composers and artists in all fields.

To establish between the artist and society the right relationship—to avoid his subservience yet to assure his involvement in the national purpose—this is one of the great and challenging tasks before our democracy today.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have taken the floor of this House to speak on a subject which for several years has been of increasingly serious concern to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers of Congress. But then this is the first time I have had personal experience with this issue. I refer to the claim by the Congress of its right to obtain information from the executive branch of Government in the face of a claim by the Executive of a right to deny the information because of its executive privilege.

From Febraury 6 through February 14 of this year, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was before the subcommittee on Department of Defense appropriations of which I am the ranking minority member. During the course of our committee's lengthy interrogation of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and General Taylor, the subject of the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961 was raised. The committee members were concerned about the events of that effort, for although it took place 2 years ago it is still a matter of considerable controversy and discussion. Further, it was felt that a full understanding of what happened there would enable the committee to better exercise its judgment of the financial needs of the military establishment. It is our subcommittee which has original congressional jurisdiction each year of the budget for the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Because of the group's control over funds for the military and related agencies, it has specific concern with and responsibility